

REMARKS

Claims 2-24 and 26-29 were pending in the application. Claims 2-24 and 26-29 have been cancelled. Claims 30-49 are newly submitted. Applicant respectfully requests consideration of the newly submitted claims.

I. The § 103 Rejections

Claims 2, 12-16, 19-24, and 26-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,319,453 (“Copriviza”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,826,165 (“Echeita”) and U.S. Patent No. 6,597,405 (“Iggulden”).

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Copriviza, Echeita and Iggulden in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,570,996 (“Linnartz”).

Claims 4-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Copriviza, Echeita, and Iggulden in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,173,271 (“Goodman”).

Claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Copriviza, Echeita, and Iggulden in further view of U.S. Patent No. 5,574,495 (“Caporizzo”).

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Copriviza, Echeita, and Iggulden in further view of Goodman.

Claim 29 recites a system for monitoring quality of service of play out of a digital video program. In particular, the system includes a program source to encode each frame of the digital video program with a first unique signature that identifies the frame as being associated with the digital video program. The system further includes a play-out device to compute statistics associated with play-out of the digital video program, in which the play-out device includes a signature engine to generate a second unique signature for each frame of the digital video

program being played out; and a matching engine to compare the second unique signature generated for each frame with a corresponding first unique signature encoded with the frame.

Applicant respectfully submits that none of the references cited above (either alone or in combination) discloses a play-out device generating a second unique signature for each frame of the digital video program being played out; and comparing the second unique signature generated for each frame with a corresponding first unique signature encoded with the frame.

Applicant, therefore, respectfully submits that claim 29 (and the claims that depend therefrom) are allowable over the references cited above.

Claim 40 incorporates limitations similar to those of claim 29. Claim 40 (and the claims that depend therefrom) are also allowable over the references cited above for reasons corresponding to those set forth with respect to claim 29.

Applicant submits that claims 29-49 are allowable over the references cited above, and are in condition for allowance. Should any unresolved issues remain, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,
SAWYER LAW GROUP LLP



Kelvin Vivian
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 53,727
(650) 475-1448

August 15, 2006
Date